

CONGRATULATING THE LEWIS CASS "LADY KINGS" SOFTBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE CLASS 2A INDIANA STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CHRIS CHOCOLA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 2006 Class 2A State Champion Lewis Cass Softball team.

Led by coach Brent Blinn and assistant coaches Scott Rouch, Greg Comoglio, and Mike Stow these 17 talented girls beat Frankton High School 3-0 to clinch the championship.

The Championship game, all five and a half hours of it, capped off an incredible 28-2 season where the Lady Kings faced and defeated the best competition Indiana has to offer. These talented young ladies are a great example of how teamwork, commitment, discipline, and confidence will lead to success.

The team includes: Krista Weber, Kayla Blinn, Misty Collins, Rachel Comoglio, Brittany LoCoco, Jennifer Berlet, Emily Watkins, Taylor DeHaven, Alexandra Rouch, Ollmay Wilson, Molly Naphew, Anna Tweed, Samantha Roller, Morgan Baker, Danya Long, Ashley Snider and Haley Tolle.

I am truly fortunate to have the opportunity to recognize these incredible women. It is my wish that their story of triumph will encourage both men and women of all walks of life, whether they play sports or not, to follow their dreams, believe in their friends, and not give up until they can hoist the trophy of victory above their heads like the Lady Kings of Lewis Cass.

THE IMPORTANCE OF U.S. FOREIGN AID

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD, an article by Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Nicholas D. Kristof discussing the merits of U.S. foreign aid. In the article, titled Foreign Aid Has Flaws. So What?, published in the June 13, 2006 edition of the New York Times, Mr. Kristof demands a dialogue to increase the effectiveness of our foreign aid. It is good to see the subject of foreign aid being addressed in the New York Times editorial pages because there needs to be public education about the benefits of foreign aid for the poor and also for the United States.

Eradicating global poverty is the first objective of the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals. With that in mind we must recognize the need for increasing the effectiveness of the money that is provided through foreign assistance programs every year. Mr. Kristof initiates his point by acknowledging the central reality that "helping people can be much harder than it looks." For example, food assistance lowers prices in the markets of the recipient countries and continues the impact by discouraging local farmers from planting the next season.

Economists have argued that aid can have adverse effects on a country's economic system. It pushes up the local exchange rates, discouraging local manufacturing; it breeds foreign assistance dependency by cutting down room for internal development of industries and opportunities. At the same time our aid saves lives. "For pennies [we] can vaccinate a child and save his/her life. For only \$5, [we] can buy a mosquito net and save several people from malaria." In Darfur we haven't done nearly enough to establish permanent peace and stability, but our aid has kept thousands of people alive.

Keeping these facts in mind, my dear colleagues, I ask you all to join me in taking constructive steps to increase both the amount of U.S. foreign aid and the efficiency in distributing it to nations that are in dire need of assistance. We, as representatives of the most powerful nation of the world, must lead the way and work with international organizations that can share this burden with us.

[From The New York Times, June 13, 2006]

FOREIGN AID HAS FLAWS. SO WHAT?

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

Don't tell anyone, but a dirty little secret within the foreign aid world is that aid often doesn't work very well.

Now that truth has been aired (and sometimes exaggerated) in a provocative new book by William Easterly, "The White Man's Burden." Mr. Easterly, a former World Bank official who is now an economics professor at New York University, has tossed a hand grenade at the world's bleeding hearts—and, worst of all, he makes some valid points.

Let me say right off that stingy Republicans should not read this book. It might inflame their worst suspicions.

But the rest of us should read it, because there is a growing constituency for fighting global poverty, and we need to figure out how to make that money more effective.

I disagree with many of Professor Easterly's arguments, but he's right about one central reality: helping people can be much harder than it looks. When people are chronically hungry, for example, shipping in food can actually make things worse, because the imported food lowers prices and thus discourages farmers from planting in the next season. (That's why the United Nations, when spending aid money, tries to buy food in the region rather than import it.)

On one of my last trips to Darfur, I had dinner at a restaurant in Nyala called K2. Out back were 18 big white S.U.V.'s belonging to the U.N. and aid groups; that amounted to nearly \$1 million worth of vehicles, in a country where people are starving.

The aid workers are struggling heroically in a dangerous and difficult place, and I don't begrudge them reliable vehicles. But something seems wrong when international agencies are more successful at maintaining S.U.V.'s than clinics. (One reason is that budgeting is often done annually, and one of the ways to spend a grant in a single year is to buy a vehicle.)

It's well-known that the countries that have succeeded best in lifting people out of poverty (China, Singapore, Malaysia) have received minimal aid, while many that have been flooded with aid (Niger, Togo, Zambia) have ended up poorer. Thus many economists accept that aid doesn't generally help poor countries grow, but argue that it does stimulate growth in poor countries with good governance. That was the conclusion of a study in 2000 by Craig Burnside and David Dollar. Professor Easterly repeated that study, using a larger pool of data, and—alas—found no improvement even in countries with good governance.

Saddest of all, Raghuram Rajan and Arvind Subramanian of the International Monetary Fund have found that "aid inflows have systematic adverse effects on a country's competitiveness." One problem is that aid pushes up the local exchange rate, discouraging local manufacturing. Mr. Subramanian also argues that aid income can create the same kinds of problems as oil income—that famous "oil curse"—by breeding dependency and undermining local institutions.

All these findings can be pretty shattering to a bleeding-heart American. But cheer up.

Some other studies indicate that aid does improve growth (economists don't agree about this any more than they agree about anything else). And whatever the impact on economic growth rates, aid definitely does something far more important: it saves lives.

For pennies, you can vaccinate a child and save his or her life. For \$5 you can buy a family a large mosquito net and save several people from malaria. For \$250, you can repair a teenage girl's fistula, a common childbirth injury, and give her a life again.

The Center for Global Development, a Washington think tank, has published a terrific book, "Millions Saved," demonstrating how health projects have saved lives. Eradicating smallpox and reducing river blindness have improved the lives of more people for less money than almost any investment imaginable. In Darfur, we haven't done nearly enough. But our aid shipments have kept alive hundreds of thousands of people.

For my whole adult life, I've sponsored children through Plan USA, and in visiting my "adopted" child in places like the Philippines and Sudan, I've seen how the kids' lives are transformed by American sponsors. Aid is no panacea, but it is a lifesaver.

So let's not shy away from a conversation about the effectiveness of aid. The problems are real, but so are the millions of people alive today who wouldn't be if not for aid. In the end, if we have tough conversations about foreign aid, then I believe Americans will acknowledge the challenges—and then, clear-eyed, agree to dig more deeply than ever, for that is simply the best way we have of asserting our own humanity.

HENRY GLOVER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Henry Glover, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, New York community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing his impressive accomplishments.

Mr. Glover was born and raised in South Carolina and moved to Brooklyn, New York after graduating from high school.

He's married to his high school sweetheart Mabel and is the proud father of four children and one adopted son. Mr. Glover graduated as an auto mechanic from Berk Trade School. He also attended LaGuardia Community College and earned his certification in Management. After many years of loyal and dedicated service, Mr. Glover retired from Eagle Electric Company.

Noting a need for change, Mr. Glover started volunteering in the community in the late seventies with the East New York Democratic Club. He later was appointed President of the